

Truro Planning Board Work Session
Minutes of Meeting February 20, 2007 – 7:00 p.m.
Truro Public Library

Members present: Ansel Chaplin, William Golden, Karen Snow, William Worthington (chair),
Nicholas Brown, Robert Weinstein,
Member absent: Deborah Paine
Others attending: Charleen Greenhalgh (Assistant Town Administrator/Planner)

William Worthington called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

The purpose of the work session – to review and discuss the draft Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in Truro.

A copy of written comments from Richard Lay, Slade Associates, was distributed to the Board. Mrs. Greenhalgh indicated to the Board that several people had contacted her regarding the draft and were interested in commenting on the document, but did not have adequate time to respond.

It was pointed out that the changes to the regulations do not affect lots sizes, setback, or any other zoning requirements. What the changes do cover is what information needs to be present on plans submitted, how roads should be built, how inspections will be handled, etc.

Ms. Snow reviewed and hi-lighted the changes in the regulations.

§§1.1 – 1.5 there are no major changes.

§1.6 – numerous definitions have been added, for example definition of Road/Street. It was suggested that language from the current version of the rules be included in the introduction regarding other sources for definitions.

§2 – ANR's and Preliminary filings and procedural requirements are standard. State law, with regard to Preliminary plans is very specific as to what has to be shown on a plan.

§2.5.3 – Staking of Proposed Subdivision – this is a new item and requirement.

§2.5.7 – Evidence of Satisfactory Performance – this has been expanded. It is much more requirement oriented.

§2.5.9 – Homeowners' Association – language expanded to be more specific.

§2.5.10 – Maintenance of Streets – this is new language and a new requirement.

§2.6 – Open Space Development – this is an existing option within the zoning by-law. It has been brought into the regulation to let the reader know that this is a concept or option available. Mr. Brown asked about requiring a cluster for land over a certain size or number of lots created. It appears that the change would be a zoning change.

§3 – This section under the current regulations, although with the same title “Design Standards”, contains requirements and language that are not consistent with design standards. This section has been streamlined to try to include only design standards language.

§3.4 – Monuments – the language has been expanded and it is more specific.

§3.6.3 – Curb Cuts – new item and language.

§3.6.5 – Access and §3.6.6 – Dead-end streets – both new items and language. Mr. Brown still has philosophical difficulties with these two sections and the restriction that they create. He will look at existing situation, provide alternatives and report back to the Board.

§3.6.7 – Adjacent properties – new item and language. It was agreed the language here needs additional work. There needs to be better specification or clarification of where buffers are to be located. It was also suggested that a reference for where to find a list of “native” vegetation can be found.

§3.6.8 – Design Standards – this is new and included in this a new Geometric Design Standards for Subdivisions table (Table 1) – Appendix 2.

§3.7 – Rural Road Alternative and §3.8 – Rights-of-way for access – are both new items.

§3.9 – Adequate Access to Site – the language has been expanded and clarified.

§4.1.2 – Clearing, Grubbing and Excavation and §4.1.3 Erosion Control Measures are both new sections.

§4.1.5 – Sub-base – the language has been expanded.

§4.1.10 – Vegetation – this is a new item. There still needs to be a standard or specification for the type of loam and seeding to be used in revegetation. Mrs. Greenhalgh will check with the Extension Service in Barnstable to see what they recommend. Also should include that native vegetation should be used within the cul-de-sac if they are to be planted.

§4.2 – Drainage – more specific requirements. Need to clarify language to allow for swales.

§4.4 – Inspections – expanded and more specific language and requirements.

§5 – Acceptance of Private Roads – this already exists, however if has been relocated to this section, towards the end of the documents. There are more specific requirements for complying with this particular process.

Appendix 1 – The fees were moved to an appendix to allow for easier updates. The fees have also increased, following a review of Lower Cape fees.

Appendix 3 – New Inspection Form.

The Board then reviewed comments received from Richard Lay. Agreed with his comments regarding the requirement to also file the original document when make an application. The preparer of the plan should retain this document until the time comes to endorse the original plan.

The Board agreed that specifying a scale for the locus map was not necessary.

It was explained that the purpose of the 1" = 100' scale plan was to distribute the plan to Police, Fire, DPW, etc. once the plan has been endorsed, so that they do not have to wait for the updated Assessors map book to show the new location of a subdivision.

The Board agreed that language under §2.5.2.b(9) would be clarified to not require the easements for utilities to be shown, as NSTAR does not design these until after the plan is recorded.

The Board agreed to ask Mr. Lay about using photogrammetric surveys, through Mrs. Greenhalgh.

The Board agreed to change the requirement for showing proposed bound locations on the plan (§2.5.2.b(17)) to requiring instead that a note be placed on the plan.

Mr. Lay made comments regarding “benchmark” requirements (§2.5.2.b(22)). Mrs. Greenhalgh will seek clarification from Mr. Lay.

The Board agreed to change the wording under §2.5.2.b(26) regarding Board of Health approvals and/or restrictions.

Mr. Lay had a problem with the mapping of trees on a subdivision plan (§2.5.2.b(30)). The Board would still like to require substantial or specimen trees of a specific size. Mrs. Greenhalgh will check with the Extension Services for recommendations. It was also

discussed that the surveyor would not want to put the trees on the definitive plan; however, they could be shown on an accompanying plan, say with the plan showing the topography. Mr. Lay had comments about an 8% maximum grade (§3.3) The Board did not agree with his comments regarding §3.6.1.e - that if the property has frontage on an existing way it is eligible for an ANR division of at least some lots than the access cannot be restricted to access from the subdivision road. If a lot is created by virtue of a definitive subdivision the Board felt, and staff concurs, that the access can be restricted to the subdivision road.

The Board agreed that the language for §3.6.7 (buffer strips) needs to be worked on.

The Board will clarify the language in §3.8 (Rights-of-way for access).

Language under §4.1.7 needs to be looked with regard to the radius of the paved area of a turnaround, the language is not correct.

The Board agreed that revegetation outside of the road layout needs to take place (§4.1.10). The language will be correct to address this.

The Board, through Mrs. Greenhalgh, will consult with Mr. Lay and others in the road design and building service to determine what is the best method or material to use for marking leaching basins (§4.2.2).

Table 2 – the Board agreed that the centerline radius needs to be re-examined. The numbers do not quite work.

Mrs. Greenhalgh will send out another letter to the other Boards and Committees to indicate when their comments should be submitted by for the draft subdivision regulations.

Mrs. Greenhalgh distributed the Board packets for the next meeting on February 27, 2007.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charleen Greenhalgh
ATA/Planner